1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

OBIE STEVEN ANTHONY,

VS.

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

21 22

20

24

25

23

26 27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEW, MATTHEW CATE, LARRY SMALL,

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 08-CV-1674 JLS (RBB)

ORDER: (1) ADOPTING REPORT (2) GRANTING MOTION FOR UDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

(Doc. Nos. 30 & 33)

Presently before the Court are Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings (Doc. No. 30) and Magistrate Judge Ruben Brooks's Report and Recommendation recommending that the motion be granted. (Doc. No. 33.) Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) set forth the duties of a district court in connection with a magistrate judge's report and recommendation. "The district court must make a de novo determination of those portions of the report . . . to which objection is made," and "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(c); see also United States v. Remsing, 874 F.2d 614, 617 (9th Cir. 1989); United States v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 676 (1980). However, in the absence of timely objection, the Court need "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (citing Campbell v. U.S. Dist. Court, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)).

Plaintiff has not objected to the Report and Recommendation. Moreover, according to Judge

- 1 -08cv1674

Casp 3:08-cv-01674-JLS-RBB Document 36 Filed 06/16/10 PageID.187 Page 2 of 2

Brooks, "Plaintiff stated that he had no objection to Defendants' Motion and also agreed to dismiss both [Defendant] Cate and [Defendant] Small." (Doc. No. 33 at 1.) Therefore the Court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation and **DISMISSES** Defendants Cate and Small. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: June 16, 2010 United States District Judge

- 2 - 08cv1674